

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL**

**NEW DELHI BENCH**

**Appeal No. 176/252/PB/2018**

**IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 252 OF THE COMPANIES ACT,  
2013 (18 of 2013)**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**RUBENIUS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED**

**...APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES**

**And another**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**Order Pronounced on:11.09.2018**

**CORAM: DR. DEEPTI MUKESH**

**MEMBER (Judicial)**

**For the Appellant:** Mr. Manoj K. Garg, Mr. Siddhartha Patra  
Mr. Achint Gupta, Advocates

**For the Respondent:** Ms. Kusum Yadav, Company Prosecutor  
For Registrar of Companies  
Ms. Lakshmi Gurung Adv. with Ms. Easha  
Kadian, Advocate for Income Tax

**MEMO OF PARTIES****Rubenius India Private Limited****Registered Office at 6/41**

Sunder Kiran Building 209,

W.E.A. Karol Bagh,

New Dlehi-110005

**...Appellant****VERSUS****Registrar of Companies,**

Ministry of Corporate Affairs,

4<sup>th</sup> Floor IFCI Tower,

61 Nehru Place,

New Delhi-110019

**...Respondent No. 1****Commissioner of Income Tax**

Ward no. 1(3),

C.R. Building, I.P. Estate,

New Delhi – 110002

**...Respondent No. 2****ORDER**

1. This appeal is filed by the company, M/s Rubenius India Private Limited (for brevity the 'Company'), through its Director, Mr. Zanjeer Ahmed, under Section 252(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 (for brevity 'the Act') against the order of striking off the name of the company passed by the

respondent under section 248 (1) of the Act read with Rule 7 of Companies (Removal of Names of Companies from the Register of Companies) Rules, 2016 published on 30.06.2017 vide notification no. ROC-DEL/248(5)/STK-7/2879 by Registrar of Companies, the respondent herein.

2. The company is incorporated as a Private Limited Company under the provision of Companies Act, 1956 with the Registrar of Companies, NCT of Delhi and Haryana on 22.12.2011 having CIN U31900DL2011PTC229124.
3. The company is having registered office at 6/41, Sunder Kiran Building 209, W.E.A. Karol Bagh, New Dlehi-110005.
4. Authorized share capital of the Company is Rs.1,00,000/- divided into 10,000 equity shares of Rs.10/- each and issued, subscribed and paid up share capital of the Company is Rs.1,00,000/- divided into 10,000 equity shares of Rs.10/- each.
5. The main objects of the company are:
  - i. To carry out the business of developing software and all activities related to it including those in the field of

hardware development or sales which are required to bring any software so developed to a marketable state and to carry on the business of providing technology consulting and all activities related to make this service acceptable to all our clients and providing export management consultancy and all related activities.

And other main objects.

6. As per the notice of non-compliance of provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 in respect to filing of annual returns and financial statements since incorporation, the name of the company was struck off in terms of provision of Section 248(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Rule 7 and Rule 9 of the Companies (Removal of Names of Companies from the Register of Companies) Rules, 2016.
7. The Appellant has submitted that the company was in operation and the business activities were carried out by the company during the period of striking off but the reporting of such activities through Annual Returns and Financial Statement had not been filed with Registrar of Companies due to inadvertence on part of the management.

8. The appellants have stated that no notice under section 248(1) of the Act in the form of STK-1 was received by the Company or any of the directors or any person on their behalf and hence not afforded any opportunity of being heard before striking of the name of the company.
9. However, without going into the controversy of the latches in following the due procedure of law by Registrar of Companies before the final act of striking off the name of the company from the register of companies maintained by Registrar of Companies, for non-filing of statutory documents by company for the relevant period, through publication of notice on 30.06.2017, the appellants have preferred to prove with documents and records that the company was in operation and doing business during the period of striking off the name of the company as a better remedy.
10. The Appellant has brought forward the following facts about it being in operation and functional during the period of striking off:

- i. The copy of Bank Statement of company issued by Kotak Mahindra Bank, from 31.01.2012 to 31.12.2017, reflecting various transactions done by the company during the period of striking off and having closing balance of Rs. 20,339/- as on 31.12.2017.
- ii. The copies of financial statements of the company for the financial years from 31.03.2013 to 31.03.2017. The Balance Sheet as on 31.03.2017 reflects fixed assets of Rs. 4,19,638/- and Loss of Rs. 54,71,989/-
- iii. The copies of Income Tax Returns filed for the assessment years 2012-13 to 2016-17 as NIL returns.
- iv. The copy of tenancy agreement, dated 12.11.2014 between Mr. Diganta Dhar Rajkhowa as owner and the appellant company as tenant for the property situated at H-608 Silver Oak, 12-Manik Nagar, RGB Road, Guwahati, Kamrup admeasuring

about 1860 square feet for a term of twelve months, having a monthly rental of Rs. 22,000/-

- v. The copy of purchase order for the financial year from 26.03.2015 to 06.02.2017 issued by various parties.
  - vi. The copy of letter, dated 09.05.2018 issued by the Shillong Municipal Board approving the quotation for supply and installation of solar street lamps submitted by the appellant company.
  - vii. The copy of authorization letters issued by several entities like Reliance, IBM executed in the financial year 2014, in favour of the appellant company for appointment of smart grid implementing agency for execution of smart grid pilot project.
11. It is further submitted by the Appellants that the failure to file financial statements and annual returns with the Registrar of Companies, NCT of Delhi and Haryana was due to inadvertence on part of the management and due to lack

of professional guidance and as such there was no wilful or mala-fide motive behind non-filing of the Financial Statements and Annual returns.

12. The Registrar of Companies has stated that it has no objection if the name of the Company is restored on proving by the Company that it was carrying on business or was in operation and the Company be also directed to file financial statements up to date with appropriate filing and additional fees.
13. The Income Tax Department has submitted in its report that there is no outstanding demand against the Assessee and has no objection if the company is considered for revival.
14. The Section 252(3) contemplates that one of the three conditions are required to be satisfied before exercising jurisdiction to restore company to its original name on the register of the Registrar of Companies namely:
  - i. That the company at the time of its name was struck off was carrying on business.

- ii. Or it was in operation
  - iii. Or it is otherwise just that the name of the company be restored on the register.
15. The Appellant have submitted sufficient evidence that it has been in operation since incorporation and therefore could not be termed as defunct company. Thus, taking into consideration the provisions of Section 252(3) of the Companies Act, 2013 which vests this Tribunal with a discretion where the Company whose name has been struck off and such Company is able to demonstrate that there is a running business as on the date when the name was struck off and also keeping in consideration that it is just to do so can restore the name of the Company in the Register and in the interest of all stakeholders including the Appellant itself who seeks restoration of the name of the Company in the register maintained by Registrar of Companies, the company deserved to be restored.
16. Accordingly, this appeal is allowed. The Public Notice of Registrar of Companies striking the name of the company is

set aside. The restoration of the company's name to the Register of Registrar of Companies is ordered subject to its filing of all outstanding documents with proper filing fees along with additional fees required under law and completion of all formalities, including payment of any late fee or any other charges which are leviable by the respondent for the late filing of statutory returns, and also subject to payment of cost of Rs. 25,000/- to be paid to Prime Minister's Relief Fund. The name of the Appellant Company shall then, as a consequence, stand restored to the Register of the Registrar of Companies, as if the name of the company had not been struck off in accordance with Section 248(1) of the Companies Act, 2013.

17. The appeal is disposed of accordingly.
18. Let the copy of the order be served to the parties.

Sd/-

**(DR. DEEPTI MUKESH)**  
**MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

